

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant has carefully considered this application in connection with the Examiner's Final Action and respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks. The Applicant originally submitted Claims 1-23 in the application. In an amendment mailed July 20, 2004, the Applicant amended Claims 1, 9 and 17, and cancelled Claims 5, 13 and 21. In this response, the Applicant has amended Claims 1, 9 and 17, and added new Claims 24-26. The new claims correspond to previously cancelled claims 5, 13 and 21. In addition, the new claims and the amended claim language in Claims 1, 9 and 17 further clarify the presently claimed invention. Accordingly, Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20 and 22-26 are currently pending in the application.

I. Formal Matters and Objections

The Examiner has objected to the abstract of the disclosure because the current abstract does not reflect the inventive feature of the claimed invention to distinguish it over the prior art. In response, the Applicant offers an amended abstract that more fully reflects the inventive feature of the claimed invention to distinguish it over the prior art, and appreciates the Examiner bringing this to his attention. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw his objection to the abstract.

The Applicant also offers an amendment to paragraph [0038] of the specification to correct a typographical error.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20, 22, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, for example, the Examiner asserts that in Claim 1, it is not clear how the slots in the PC queue are used and what the utility is of having more slots. In response, the Applicant has amended independent Claims 1, 9 and 17 to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention. The Applicant also submits an amendment to paragraph [0019] of the specification to remove any ambiguity that might have existed in the terms used to describe the embodiments of the invention. Support for the amended and added claims can be found in paragraph [0019], FIG. 4 and the corresponding discussion in the text. In light of these amendments, the Applicant sees the Examiner's rejection as moot, and respectfully requests removal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶2.

III. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,578,134 to Van Dyke, *et al.* The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As illustrated in Figure 3, Van Dyke discloses branch processing with an alternate PC 34 and a target PC. The branch processing, however, does not include a mispredict PC queue that has as many slots as a number of staging registers as recited in independent Claims 1, 9 and 17. Thus, Van Dyke does not teach each element of independent Claims 1, 9 and 17 and claims dependent thereon. Van Dyke, therefore, does not anticipate Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20 and 23. Accordingly, the Applicant

respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the §102(e) rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20 and 23 and allow issuance thereof.

IV. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20 and 23 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,933,850 to Kumar, *et al.* The Applicants respectfully disagree.


Kumar does not teach mispredict PC storage including a mispredict PC queue and a number of staging registers with the mispredict PC queue having at least as many slots as the number of staging registers as recited in Claims 1, 9 and 17. In fact, the Applicant does not even find any teaching in Kumar of a queue for mispredict PC values. Accordingly, Kumar does not teach each element of independent Claims 1, 9 and 17, and as such, is not an anticipating reference for Claims 1, 9 and 17 and Claims dependent thereon. Therefore, the Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the §102(b) rejection of Claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-20 and 23 and allow issuance thereof.

V. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicant now sees all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicits a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
HITT GAINES, P.C.


J. Joel Justices
Registration No. 48,981

Dated: 10/06/04

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER: _____**

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.